

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WE NEED BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE—AND WE HAVE ABSOLUTELY NO DEFENSE TODAY

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues and citizens across our Nation to carefully consider the following statement by former Reagan defense official Richard Perle regarding our lack of ballistic missile defense. The ballistic missile threat is real, and the technology is readily available to deter and destroy incoming missiles and warheads. It will be unforgivable if another American soldier, sailor, airman, marine, or civilian is killed by a ballistic missile attack because Congress and the President failed to develop and deploy available missile defense technology.

STATEMENT BY RICHARD PERLE, FELLOW, AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, JANUARY 25, 1995

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Committee for inviting me to appear before you as you consider the ballistic missile defense provisions of H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act.

I first came to Washington nearly 24 years ago to work on precisely this issue—the defense of the United States against ballistic missiles—for Senator Henry M. (Scoop) Jackson.

Scoop was a committed Democrat. But he was also an ardent supporter of ballistic missile defenses. In those days the defense of the United States was not inevitably a partisan matter. And it is my great hope, Mr. Chairman, that with these hearings and with new Congressional management willing to reconsider old ideas and explore new ones, the urgent need to develop and deploy a defense against ballistic missiles will once more gain the bipartisan support that men like Scoop Jackson worked so hard to achieve.

Looking back over the quarter century since Lyndon Johnson first proposed a limited deployment of strategic defenses, and looking forward to the proposals in H.R. 7, one is left with an eerie sense of *deja vu*. I say eerie because, as things stand today, we have no capacity whatsoever to intercept ballistic missiles that might be aimed at the United States. None. Zero. We are unable to stop even a single missile, even a missile fired accidentally, even a missile fired accidentally under circumstances in which the perpetrator of the accident did everything he could to help us avert a calamity. We are totally, completely, abjectly vulnerable.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, one could reasonably argue that, despite breathtaking technological advances in sensors, propulsion, guidance and data processing, we are further than ever from the goal of developing a strategic defense. For despite the collapse of the Soviet Union and the sharp rise in concern about the extent to which its nuclear missiles are under absolute control, an Amer-

ican policy favorable to strategic defense is more remote than ever.

Despite the energetic effort of several hostile nations to acquire nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles; despite the difficulty of controlling the missile technologies that will inevitably spread; despite the reasonable expectation of the American people that its elected government will act prudently to defend them against known threats—despite all this it is now the official policy of the Government of the United States that America shall remain undefended.

I urge you to change that policy quickly, unambiguously and unapologetically by adopting into law Title II of the Defense Revitalization Act.

The source of the current policy is difficult to understand, much less defend. It is, above all, an intensely ideological policy devised by the opponents of strategic defense. Opposition to defense is frequently emotional, although the depth of feeling is often masked by claims to practical or budgetary or technical doubts about the feasibility or affordability or effectiveness of specific systems. It is based in part on the now irrelevant but passionately held Cold War belief that American strategic defenses would elicit additional offensive deployments by the Soviet Union, thus fueling an arms race and exposing us to greater danger. This was the view of the opponents of strategic defenses when I came to Washington in 1969 in the midst of the Cold War and, curiously, the opponents of those years remain the opponents of strategic defense to this very day.

Everything affecting this antiquated intellectual construct has changed: the Cold War is over, the Soviet Union no longer exists, the interaction of offensive and defensive forces (which was never as simple as the critics of strategic defense thought) is radically different today, the efficacy of classical deterrence in these changed circumstances is increasingly questionable, the technical feasibility of effective defenses is immeasurably greater (especially against less-sophisticated threats)—in short, everything is changed except the stubborn, unthinking, myopic opposition to any serious, national defense against ballistic missiles.

This is an opposition enshrined in an obsolete treaty concluded 22 years ago in a fundamentally different world. It is an opposition perpetuated by an Administration that can't bear the idea of picking up where Ronald Reagan left off or taking on the apparatchiki from Andrei Gromyko's foreign ministry who cling to their jobs by opposing sensible modifications to the ABM Treaty that would free us and Russia from constraints that leave us both defenseless in a dangerous world.

Another source of opposition to strategic defense is the idea that only a perfect defense is worth having. When the issue was a defense against the massive Soviet missile force, the opposition argued that because even the best possible defense could be penetrated ("Some missiles will always get through") there was no point in attempting any defense at all. Now that the threat is much smaller—perhaps a handful of missiles or even a single missile fired accidentally—

the idea of a partial defense capable of dealing with modest threats ought to appeal to those critics who once claimed to be daunted by the task of defending against thousands of missiles. But they remain unmoved, mired in opposition to any defense, frozen in time, say around 1970.

In the seriously mistaken belief that we must now agree on a line separating theater defense systems, which are not limited under the ABM Treaty, from national territorial systems which are, the Administration has embarked on a negotiation with the Russians that threatens to throttle effective theater defenses in their infancy.

I note that the House leadership has written to the President to ask that he allow the Congress to examine with care the many issues this negotiation raises. This seems to me a reasonable request, one that a President interested in bipartisanship on defense matters would readily grant. I hope he agrees. But if he does not I would urge the Congress to legislate against the use of appropriated funds for the purpose of defining lines of demarcation between theater and strategic defenses. A negotiation on this subject is bound to become a quagmire—and that would be true even if there were not plenty of opponents of strategic defense within the Administration who are eager to see theater defenses submerged in a quagmire and who will do nothing to steer clear of it.

On this matter our position should be clear and simple. Theater defenses are not limited by the ABM Treaty and for this reason we are not obliged to discuss our theater defense program with the Russians or anyone else. If the Russians wish to assert that we are developing a nationwide defense in the guise of a theater defense, let them charge us with a violation of the ABM Treaty. If and when they do make such an allegation we will discuss and allay their concerns in the forum provided for in the ABM Treaty.

What we would be most foolish to do is try to gain Russian approval for the performance parameters of theater defenses. Yet that has been the Administration's approach until now, and you should know that it threatens our ability to field theater systems capable of defending our men and women on distant battlefields. We owe it to our troops to provide them with the best possible defense against the battlefield missiles that may be aimed at them. To constrain our program in order to "strengthen" the ABM Treaty by broadening its scope would be foolish in the extreme and the Congress should act if necessary to prevent this happening.

Opponents of strategic and theater defense are not at all troubled by the additional constraints on our freedom to develop technically optimal systems that are bound to result from negotiations with the Russians. On the contrary, I believe they view these negotiations as another device by which the prospects of a cost-effective defense might be further diminished.

Mr. Chairman, there is already a wide range of opinion as to the sort of architecture we should adopt in devising systems of national and theater defense. If anything, controversy on this question is likely to increase over time as the technical community

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

debates the relative merits of space-based interceptors or lasers or land-based missiles or space-based sensors, and the like. Competing technologies have their adherents and as technology develops opinions will change. This is all to the good. No one now enjoys a monopoly of wisdom as to the most effective systems or the lowest technical risk or the least-cost solutions to the problems of theater and national defense.

But it is not necessary for the Committee to come to conclusions on these and other technical issues in order to go forward confidently to require the Secretary of Defense to tell you how he plans to carry out Title II's mandate to end the policy of deliberate vulnerability by developing theater and strategic ballistic missile defenses.

In developing his plans, the Secretary of Defense should consider that, insofar as the ABM Treaty is an obstacle to implementing Title II, he should recommend the ways in which the Treaty ought to be changed. There are, after all, provisions for amendment in the terms of the ABM Treaty. They were presumably placed there by men who realized that future circumstances might require new approaches. In this they were surely right. We should approach the Russians at the highest levels with a view to cooperatively amending the Treaty to take account of the strikingly different world in which we are now living.

But if the Russians, for whatever reason, should oppose reasonable revisions to the Treaty and insist on blocking us from defending ourselves against the North Koreans, Libyas, Iraqs and the like, we should make clear our readiness to withdraw from the Treaty under the appropriate article and after the appropriate notice. If we are prepared to withdraw, we should find it unnecessary to do so.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress has it within its power to force a reconsideration of the opposition to ballistic missile defense that prevailed during the last decades of the Cold War. It is a new Congress. I believe it is up to the task of new thinking about defense, and your hearing this morning encourages me to believe that antiquated ideas that cannot be made persuasive as we face the new millennium should be relegated to the history of the one we will leave behind.

RECOGNITION OF FRED JACKSON, SR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to recognize Mr. Fred Jackson, Sr. of Jackson, MS. Mr. Jackson reached the age of 115 in January 1995. Thus, he is one of the oldest persons in the United States. He was born in the Cauldville community near Canton, MS in 1880. He was married to Mrs. Fronie Jackson who is now deceased and is the father of one son, Mr. Fred Jackson, Jr.

Mr. Jackson worked as a farmer and carpenter for many years. He has been a devoted member of the Pleasant Grove Baptist Church where he served as a deacon and Sunday school teacher. He enjoys fishing, hunting and helping people. Mr. Jackson also enjoys reading the Bible. He attributes his long life to his strong religious beliefs and treating every person with respect.

I congratulate Mr. Jackson on a long and fruitful life and his important contributions to the Jackson community.

INTRODUCTION OF THE OLD FAITHFUL PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Old Faithful Protection Act of 1995. This will be the third Congress that I have introduced legislation seeking to protect Yellowstone National Park's natural wonders.

The legislation I present today is essentially the bill that passed the House of Representatives last Congress by overwhelming margins. There are just two notable exceptions, both improvements that should provide even more support for the bill.

This legislation now provides for a land trade with the only private geothermal-rights holder adjacent to Yellowstone and it incorporates the changes suggested by the Idaho and Wyoming Governors. These changes remove any questions regarding private property rights or State acceptance issues raised each Congress by the Senate.

With, to my knowledge, all questions answered I have high hopes that this Congress we will demonstrate the legislative will to finally protect the crown jewels of our national treasure—Yellowstone National Park. Twice before the House of Representatives has passed protection for Yellowstone, and twice now the tiniest minority of antienvironmental Senators have blocked its consideration in the Senate. Twice now a few Senators have refused to allow legislation to even be heard unless everyone involved will agree with them up front.

There is no question that this Congress will be wrestling with a wide variety of environmental issues. Many believe that the Republican contract is really open warfare on this Nation's environmental law. I believe that the verdict is still out but, one thing I know for certain, failure to pass this legislation will be a clear indication of the new majority's inability to even address the most basic environmental concerns.

This legislation recognizes the ongoing work that State and private folks have done to protect Yellowstone geothermal features while still providing clear direction and a legal framework to build on these various efforts. This legislation is the result of legislative efforts begun in the 1988 amendments to the Geothermal Steam Lease Act. That legislation established a list of geothermal resources that should not be allowed to be developed under this Nation's steam leasing laws. Yellowstone was the most threatened of these cultural sites and it was chosen as a test case for protection.

Since that time State and Federal officials have worked toward a cooperative way of protecting Yellowstone thermal wonders. All concerned agree that although gains have been made this legislation presented today is keenly necessary to complete our pledge to provide

rock-ribbed, ironclad, copper-riveted protection for Yellowstone's geysers, and hot pots.

The legislation also provides a pattern for the protection of other geothermal treasures such as Crater Lake in Oregon. This legislation is a bipartisan proposal that has complete support from the State governments adjacent to the park and it shares environmental support with no known development concern.

The land exchange that is attached to the bill removes the only permit, given in any State, for drilling hot water adjacent to Yellowstone. The exchange provides solutions to access problems while granting to the Government hundreds of claims to hot water in the Corwin Springs KGRA. Public access in general is improved to federal land and the Church Universal and Triumphant is provided a welcome solution to their longstanding inholding problems.

This exchange solves a problem created by the time it has taken to address this issue and is luckily the only problem that currently exists. Failure to act will only make a final solution more difficult. Wrongheaded ideology is all that stands in the way of true statutory protection for Yellowstone and Old Faithful.

I hope we will move quickly to save the last intact geyser basin in the world. It is our duty to do so.

A TRIBUTE TO THE NEEDLES MUSTANGS

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring to your attention today a remarkable group of individuals who recently made the citizens of Needles, CA particularly proud. I am speaking of the Needles High School varsity football team—the Mustangs—who will be remembered not for their record but for the fact that they played like champions all season. To me, and many others, they are winners in every sense of the word.

The Mustangs, who started the season with only 18 players, worked extremely hard to represent their school but suffered a number of heartbreaking injuries during the season. In fact, in one game, 9 members of the team played every single play of the game on offense and defense because injuries left the team with only 13 players dressed to play. For most of the season, the squad was outmanned, undersized, and overwhelmed by larger schools. But the Mustangs never quit. They fought hard and, more importantly, played with heart, winning the respect of their families, opposing coaches, and the entire community.

It would have been easy for these kids to give up going into their last game of the season winless. But they didn't. Because they would not ever quit, the Mustangs fought for every yard and persevered in the face of adversity, winning a hard fought contest, 25 to 18. When the final gun had sounded, one would have thought they had won the Super Bowl. I guess in many respects they did. Most inspiring was the fact that these young men,

all from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, demonstrated what it means to work together, to continue to work hard, and to never give up. Their commitment, courage, and determination provides an example for us all to admire, and emulate. They are our greatest hope for the future of Needles and the future of our country. To me, and the many people who make Needles their home, it was truly a championship year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and the many friends of the Needles Mustangs in recognizing their commitment to winning on and off the field. They have taught all of us many things and are certainly worthy of recognition by the House today.

AN AGREEMENT WORTH PRESERVING

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, as you know, North Korea's efforts to acquire a nuclear weapons arsenal constitute one of the most serious national security threats facing the United States today.

Last October, Ambassador-at-Large Robert I. Gallucci negotiated an agreement with North Korea that holds out the promise of freezing and eventually eliminating North Korea's nuclear weapons program. The Congress may face no more pressing national security issue in all of 1995 than whether to permit the implementation of this accord.

Unfortunately, there exists considerable confusion about this agreement, and the press has contained a number of erroneous statements as to what this agreement does and does not permit.

Six months ago, we were on the verge of a confrontation with North Korea—a confrontation no one wanted, and which held little possibility of addressing our concerns about North Korea's nuclear program. Today, however, as a result of the Geneva agreement, Pyongyang has frozen its nuclear program and agreed to a step-by-step process that will eventually eliminate that program.

North Korea in already taken a number of significant steps under the accord, in advance in any United States concessions. The North has already shut down its only operating reactor. It has already halted construction on two new reactors. It has already sealed its reprocessing facility and stopped construction on a new reprocessing line. It has already refrained from reprocessing its spent fuel rods, which would have given the North enough plutonium for four or five nuclear weapons. And it has already admitted IAEA inspectors and U.S. technicians into its nuclear facilities.

By accepting the record, Pyongyang has agreed not only to resume IAEA inspections of its nuclear facilities, but to go beyond its obligations under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT]. It has agreed, for instance, to forego reprocessing the spent fuel it presently possesses, and to shut down its reprocessing facility—even though the NPT permits reprocessing. And without reprocessing, the North

will not be able to obtain the plutonium required for the manufacture of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is not based on trust. It is not based on promises. It is based solely on North Korea's performance. The United States retains its ability, both through IAEA inspections and through its own national means, to verify if the North is abiding by its commitments. And if, at any time, we conclude that Pyongyang is not living up to its end of the bargain, we can back out of the deal.

The alternative to this agreement is not a better agreement. The only real alternatives are to return to the United Nations to ask for economic sanctions that no one believes will succeed, or an escalation to war.

But with this agreement, we have an accord that diminishes tensions on the Korean peninsula. An accord that protects our security interests and those of our allies. An accord that advances our global nonproliferation objectives. An accord that obligates other to pick up the overwhelming bulk of the financial costs.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I call a good bargain. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to inform themselves about this agreement and to support its implementation.

CONTROLLING THE DEFICIT

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues a grave concern for gaining control of the deficit because it stifles our national economic growth. I question the way to get there. Let me explain.

During the debate on a balanced budget, we watched Members vote for a balanced budget amendment that would protect Social Security. Others voted for a version of the amendment that would strip supermajority provisions for increasing debt limit and raising taxes, but would require a balanced budget in 7 years. Still others have urged the proponents of these measures to identify the specific cuts needed to balance the budget, but would still favor a balanced budget in 7 years, notwithstanding how cruel the answers to the plea for a balanced budget plan would be.

Allow me to state my position clearly. I do not support an arbitrary balanced budget amendment, by a certain year, to the U.S. Constitution which provides no flexibility to meet other vital national goals. I do favor a balanced budget amendment which would establish the kind of capital budget which States and cities now have. This enables them to balance their budgets, while also providing enough dollars to preserve the safety net, keep programs to further economic growth and maintain infrastructure. This kind of borrowing is both responsible and manageable; it could better ensure a decent standard of living for all Americans, regardless of income.

We need to achieve fiscal responsibility. But more importantly, we cannot destroy the security of millions of vulnerable and disadvantaged Americans that rely upon the safety net to keep their families alive.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON THE PROTECTION OF AMERICA'S SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. ANDREA H. SEASTRAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should be honored that the Democrats' chief attack dog, Mr. BONIOR, chose to use me as an example in promulgating one of his party's favorite factual errors—the Republican position on Social Security.

Just in case Mr. BONIOR and the Democrat campaign committees have misunderstood, let me be clear. As long as I am a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I will fight any effort to touch Social Security.

Unfortunately, the Democrats are continuing with vigor their failed campaign message that Republicans were out to hurt senior citizens and destroy Social Security.

If the American people did not fall for these absurd scare tactics during the recent midterm elections, what makes the Democrats think they will fall for it now? You would think that the new minority party in Congress would have gotten the message.

The facts are quite clear. The Republican Contract With America specifically states that Social Security is off the table. Republican leaders and Republican Members have stated repeatedly that the budget can be balanced by the year 2002—without touching Social Security—simply by restraining the growth in Federal spending to 3 percent annually as opposed to the scheduled 5.4 percent increase.

The basic and unspoken problem that Mr. BONIOR and his liberal colleagues have with the Republican contract is its commitment to rein in out-of-control Federal spending. What this clearly illustrates to even the most casual observers is the Democrats' total unwillingness to reduce Government spending.

Mr. Speaker, in 1993 the Clinton Democrats passed the largest tax increase in history, and one of the things they conveniently forget about this tax increase is how much it hurt America's seniors. The 1993 tax bill cut Medicare by \$85 billion and slapped \$25 billion in higher taxes on Social Security beneficiaries. Had the Clinton-Gephardt health care bill passed the Congress, it would have slashed Medicare by more than \$400 billion over 10 years and limited the program to zero growth.

By contrast the Republican contract's Senior Citizens Equity Act, which I have cosponsored, helps senior citizens. This bill, H.R. 8, includes provisions to raise the Social Security earnings limit to \$30,000 over 5 years; repeal the Clinton tax increases on Social Security retirees; and provide tax incentives for the purchase of private long-term care insurance.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is that the Republican proposals outlined in the Contract With America are designed to help older Americans and undo the damage created by the Clinton Democrats. I am afraid that the Democrats' best efforts to scare older Americans into thinking otherwise will fail just as miserably as it did during the 1994 elections.

INTERNATIONAL CUSTOMS DAY,
JANUARY 26, 1953

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago on January 26, 1953, the World Customs Organization formally known as the Customs Cooperation Council, held its first meeting in Brussels, Belgium. In recognition of this occasion, the council observes January 26 as International Customs Day. Additionally, this occasion is also being used to give recognition to customs services around the world in view of the significant role they play in producing national revenue and in protecting national borders from economically and physically harmful importations.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of our U.S. Customs Service for its invaluable contributions to the Nation over the past 206 years of its existence. U.S. Customs was once the sole revenue producer for the young United States and its role in revenue collection continues: in fiscal year 1994 Customs collected a record \$22.9 billion in revenue. In addition, Customs has taken on other important responsibilities such as interdicting narcotics at our borders, preventing the exportation of critical technology, and enforcing the regulations of more than 40 Government agencies.

The U.S. Customs Service represents the United States at the Customs Cooperation Council [CCC], a 136-member international organization founded to facilitate international trade and promote cooperation between governments on customs matters. The CCC works to simplify and standardize legal instruments and rules of international customs. The CCC also renders technical assistance in areas such as customs tariffs, valuation, nomenclature, and law enforcement. Its objective is to obtain, in the interest of international trade, the best possible degree of uniformity among the customs systems of member nations. The United States became a member on November 5, 1970. All America benefits when both exporters and importers operate in an atmosphere of simple unambiguous customs operations around the world.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Customs Cooperation Council with regard to its past accomplishments and for its ambitious goals of further harmonizing and simplifying those customs rules which affect international commerce. In addition, I congratulate our U.S. Customs Service for its outstanding work both nationally and internationally.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM
ACT OF 19953

SPEECH OF

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to curb the

practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments, to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and to provide information on the cost of Federal mandates on the private sector, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss H.R. 5 the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and share with the House the observations of San Diego Mayor Susan Golding. Recently, I had the pleasure to meet with Mayor Golding to discuss this bill and other issues before the Congress.

Mayor Golding provided me with a partial list of current Federal mandates placed on the city of San Diego. She said that besides the up-front costs, each mandate contains a hidden burden of paperwork, record keeping, and reporting. Each of these mandates has some Federal agency reviewing compliance. Moreover, most of these mandates carry penalties for noncompliance.

The most egregious example involves the requirements imposed by the Environmental Protection Agency that the city of San Diego move toward secondary treatment of wastewater. The problem is that the regulations were designed to protect rivers and lakes—fresh water. San Diego, however, has a deep discharge into the Pacific Ocean. The world renowned Scripps Institute of Oceanography has concluded that secondary treatment is unneeded in San Diego. Yet the Federal Government still insists that the city of San Diego expend some \$1.4 billion to upgrade to secondary treatment, no matter what the best scientists say. After years of litigation, the stalemate continues.

The list of mandates ranges from the obvious to the obscure. To comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the city must spend \$100,000. Swimming pool operator training costs \$1,500. The level of sand in sandboxes at city-run tot centers is monitored by the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, costing San Diego taxpayers \$75,000 a year. Reporting requirements for the CDBG program add \$20,000 in costs. Monitoring of groundwater at city landfills costs \$130,000 annually; gas monitoring adds another \$34,000.

No one questions that some Federal regulations are needed. Federal standards for health and safety have saved lives and improved the quality of life for all Americans. If an issue is important enough to demand action by the Congress, then by definition, it ought to be important enough to be funded by the Congress.

The city would meet many of these health and safety standards anyway. The problem arises when the Federal Government issues these mandates, burdening the city with record keeping, paperwork, and the potential for litigation and fines.

We know that H.R. 5 won't solve the problem of existing mandates alone. But it is still vital that Congress pass this legislation. The commission established by H.R. 5 will be chartered to review existing mandates and report recommendations for change to Congress. Further, this bill sends a clear message to our beleaguered cities, counties, and States that this Congress will no longer conduct business as usual.

The experience of San Diego is typical. I know from my discussions with other mayors and local officials that they also shoulder these burdens. In some cases, smaller communities are hit even harder than cities, as they lack the resources and staff to comply with Federal mandates.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of the bill, I urge prompt passage of H.R. 5. This bill does nothing to threaten the health and safety of the American people. It is a significant step toward reforming our attitude here in Washington.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN, INC., AND THE NATIONAL ELDERCARE INSTITUTE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to congratulate the National Council of Negro Women, Inc. and the National Eldercare Institute for a historic conference which honored older women. In October 1991, the National Council of Negro Women, Inc., entered into a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Aging, to establish a National Eldercare Institute on Older Women [NEIOW].

The National Eldercare Institute was the brainchild of Dr. Dorothy Height, the president of the National Council of Negro Women, Inc. Dr. Height's vision was to bring issues concerning older women onto a national platform.

A major goal of the NEIOW, 1 of 13 institutes nationwide, is to advocate for the diversity of experience and broad spectrum of needs, issues, and concerns of older women. Collaborative and cooperative relationships were established and maintained with national aging and women organizations, voluntary and professional organization, private businesses, churches, and other entities.

These efforts resulted in the Administration on Aging and the National Council of Negro Women, Inc., National Eldercare Institute on Older Women, sponsoring the first National Conference on Older Women: Challenges in an Aging Society. The conference brought together over 60 organizations and approximately 400 participants working cooperatively to implement the first national conference on older women.

There were five main objectives of the conference: First, offer participants indepth experiential training based on three tracks i.e., consumer/senior advocates, service providers and education research; second, increase awareness of cultural diversity and needs of women; third, expand knowledge of multicultural issues; fourth, improve skills in working effectively in multicultural settings; and fifth, encourage networking with aging specialists and national aging and women's organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to salute Dr. Dorothy A. Idleburg of Hinds County, MS. Dr. Idleburg, currently the director, of the National

Eldercare Institute on Older Women, is on leave of absence as associate professor and chairperson of the sociology department and director of gerontology program, Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, MS.

As director of the National Institute on Older Women, Dr. Idleburg took great pride in planning and implementing the national conference held in Washington, DC in September 1993. The institute under the leadership of Dr. Idleburg, continues to serve as an advocate for issues affecting older women.

A PRIVATE RELIEF BILL TO BENEFIT WADE BOMAR

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a private relief bill to award a \$100,000 injury settlement to Mr. Wade Bomar.

Mr. Speaker, in August 1989 the Pryor Gap fire was burning its way through a national forest in southeastern Montana. Among those battling the fire was an oil refinery worker from Billings named Wade Bomar. Married with three children, Bomar supplemented his income during the summer working as an emergency firefighter with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

On August 6, 1989, while struggling to slow the progress of the fire, a large tree fell on Mr. Bomar, severely damaging his back and pinning his legs under its weight. After several operations, it was apparent that the accident had left Mr. Bomar a paraplegic.

It is truly ironic that while Mr. Bomar was fighting the Pryor Gap fire of 1989, Congress was debating the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act [PSOBA]. This act awards benefits to firefighters and other public safety officers who are permanently disabled as a result of injuries sustained in the line of duty on or after November 29, 1990. Although Mr. Bomar and his family are exactly the kind of people that this act is intended to help, Mr. Bomar was injured in 1989 and therefore ineligible for benefits under the act.

As a result of Mr. Bomar's injuries, and numerous operations, he has incurred tremendous and unpayable medical bills. And because of the violent nature of the accident, new medical problems continue to arise, calling for more surgery and more debt. Having exhausted all other administrative solutions, Wade and his family live day to day on Social Security disability payments, financially ruined and without hope.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing this bill today so that an exception might be made to help a man and his family who are very deserving of our help. It is the right thing to do.

A TRIBUTE TO DOUGLAS ROWAND

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the fine work and outstanding public service of Mr. Doug Rowand of Highland, CA. Doug, a dedicated professional and longtime community activist, has recently completed his term as president of the Highland Area Chamber of Commerce.

Doug's accomplishments at the Highland Area Chamber of Commerce are well known. First elected to serve as vice president in 1992, and later elected president, Doug's tenure is marked by a number of impressive accomplishments. His leadership has resulted in increased chamber membership, actively promoted economic development and business retention in the community, held numerous candidate forums, and surveyed the membership on the direction of the chamber. He has also organized a number of successful community events including the Fourth of July parade, the Highland Community Pride Rally, and the annual Christmas decorating contest.

Over the years, Doug has been actively involved in a number of civic and community-based organizations. Last year, he was selected to serve on the board of directors of the Volunteer Center of the Inland Empire and was appointed by the mayor of San Bernardino to serve on the Community Development Citizen's Advisory Committee to make recommendations on community development block grant funds. Since 1991, Doug has served on the board of directors of Los Padrinos, an organization which provides counseling and work experience for hard core gang members and at-risk youth. From 1990 to 1993, he also served on the board of directors of Bethlehem House, a home for abused women and children which was recognized by President Bush and his Points of Light program. In addition, he has served on the board of directors of the Arrowhead United Way and the Highland Senior Center.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and Doug's many friends in recognizing his many fine achievements and selfless contributions. He has touched the lives of many people and it is only fitting that the House recognize him today.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. LASZLO N. TAUBER

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Laszlo N. Tauber, M.D., a constituent of mine from Montgomery County, MD, who resides in Potomac with his wife, Diane. Born in Budapest, Hungary on February 18, 1915 to Gyula and Katica Tauber, Dr. Tauber struggled through the antisemitism of the post-World War I era in that nation.

A graduate of the Jewish High School of Budapest, he was enrolled in medical school in 1932 at the Royal Hungarian University Medical School in Budapest. Antisemitism dominated his life at medical school, where it was typical for students and some professors to taunt and disrupt the lives of the Jewish students. Dr. Tauber remained tenacious, receiving his medical degree in October 1938. With Hungary's entry into World War II, life for the Jews of Hungary disintegrated. Jews were sent to the front battle lines and Dr. Tauber's only brother, Imre, died in a Russian forced labor camp. Miraculously, Dr. Tauber escaped the forced labor camps, deportation and death, surviving in the Jewish ghetto in Budapest along with his wife Lilly Manovill—whom he married in 1940—when more than 600,000 of his fellow Jewish Hungarians did not.

After the liberation of Hungary, Dr. Tauber continued his medical work in Budapest until August 1946 when he received a state scholarship to study neurosurgery for a year in Sweden. Dr. Tauber emigrated to the United States in November 1947, overcame many obstacles and became a well-established surgeon. In 1965, Dr. Tauber, along with many of his colleagues, founded the Jefferson Memorial Hospital in Alexandria, VA. He continued his mission to serve the community, well known never to turn away a patient at his hospital. Through the ensuing years, Dr. Tauber became a part-time developer of real estate and now is believed to be the largest landlord to the U.S. Government, developing the largest commercial office building in Montgomery County, MD.

Dr. Tauber became a philanthropist and humanist. He was in the forefront of opening up the medical profession to minorities and those American students who were forced to study medicine abroad. He soon became a benefactor, giving major gifts to Boston University, Georgetown University Medical School and Brandeis University. He extended generous contributions to the American University and the University of Maryland as well. Additionally, Dr. Tauber has endowed the Tauber Institute for the Study of European Jewish History and made significant gifts to Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Bar-Ilan University and the Israeli Academy of Science. Dr. Tauber has contributed to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum as a founding member.

Dr. Tauber has raised a family: A son, Alfred, who today is a hematologist-oncologist and professor of medicine and professor of philosophy at Boston University, and a daughter, Ingrid, a graduate of the University of Maryland, a Ph.D. in clinical psychology in private practice in San Francisco.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to pay tribute to Laszlo N. Tauber, M.D., of Potomac, MD, on his 80th birthday.

**PUBLIC RESOURCES DEFICIT
REDUCTION ACT OF 1995**

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we passed a balanced budget amendment. Today I am introducing the Public Resources Deficit Reduction Act of 1995, which will help us reach the goal of a balanced budget. This bill will take a first step toward eliminating the waste of public resources for private profit at the taxpayers' expense. As we consider options for reducing the deficit, this is a critical initiative that will bring in billions of dollars annually to the Treasury. In our necessary examination of Federal payments to all sectors of our society, corporate welfare programs must not be spared the budget axe.

This bill will restore public trust and fiscal accountability in our natural resource programs. It will require the Federal Government to receive a fair-market return on all its natural resources. It will also authorize recovery of fees from natural resource program beneficiaries to cover the costs of program administration.

Currently, public lands that belong to all Americans are managed for the benefit of a few special interests. The need for reform of these subsidy policies was highlighted last year in a report by the staff of the Natural Resources Committee, "Taking from the Taxpayer: Public Subsidies for Natural Resource Development." That report documents the dizzying array of subsidies available to natural resource industries. It's time to ask businesses operating on our western public lands to stand on their own two feet, rather than on the shoulders of hardworking taxpayers.

Recent polls show that the American people expect a fairmarket return for sales of their resources. This bill includes long-overdue reforms of mining, oil and gas leasing, logging, recreation, and grazing policies. It also eliminates the subsidies available to consumers of water and power provided by Federal projects. The reforms mandated here will begin us on the road toward eliminating the unwarranted subsidies received by these industries.

Many of the initiatives included in this bill have been proposed in the past, and several have previously passed the House of Representatives. Together, they will save billions of dollars annually, while assuring the American people a fair return on their assets.

Each year, we spend hundreds of millions of dollars on taxpayer subsidies to natural resource industries. These expenditures are not included in the Federal budget process, and there is no oversight of the corporations and individuals who benefit from these policies. This bill will require the Federal Government to start accounting for these expenditures in the annual budget submission to Congress.

Last year the House overwhelmingly approved legislation rewriting the outdated mining law of 1872, which currently allows companies to remove minerals for free and to purchase public land for as little as \$2.50 per acre. This new bill follows last year's in calling

for an 8 percent royalty rate on hardrock minerals such as gold, silver, and copper. It also puts an end to "patenting," which permits mining companies to buy public land at bargain basement prices. This provision will stop the continuing drain of billions of dollars under the current mining law; in May 1994 a Canadian company, American Barrick, paid a mere \$10,000 for land in Nevada that will yield approximately \$10 billion worth of gold.

This bill includes a major overhaul of policies for concessions operating the national parks, which also passed the House last year. The current system of fees and licenses for park concessioners gives special benefits to these businesses, rather than ensuring that the taxpayer receives a fair return from these park uses. A 1994 report prepared by the staff of Senator WILLIAM COHEN concluded, "Each year, the Federal Government relinquishes the opportunity to collect hundreds of millions of dollars in rent and franchise fees from private firms who have the exclusive right to operate concessions on Federal lands." This bill will bring charges for park concessions into line with the value of the resources used.

This legislation also requires that the Government charge fair-market rates for grazing permits, which currently lag well below rates charged on private and State lands. In addition to charging the going rate for Federal grazing leases, hundreds of millions of dollars in direct payments to ranchers for livestock feed will be halted. Furthermore, grazing fee rebates to local ranchers, which have been used in the past to sue and lobby the Government, will be retained instead in the Treasury.

Additionally, this legislation will reform Forest Service management of timber sales on public lands. The Government frequently sells timber at less than the cost required to administer the sale and build roads for timber companies. This bill will ensure a fair return for the taxpayer by forbidding these below-cost sales. It also will move all timber receipts on budget so that revenues go directly into the U.S. Treasury, rather than into unaccounted funds for local use.

Irrigators using Federal water have benefited from multiple subsidies and now pay far below the fair-market cost for the water. In some cases, they pay a hundred times less per acre-foot than neighbors who purchase water from the State or from private entities. This bill will require that all new water contracts sell the water at market rates, and eliminate the use of federally subsidized water to irrigate surplus crops. This bill will also require that the value of the Federal subsidy in existing water contracts be included in the cap on Government agricultural payments.

This legislation gives Members of Congress who profess concern for the deficit, for Federal spending, and for getting Government out of business the opportunity to demonstrate their sincerity on these issues. The array of proposals we have heard in the last weeks has not addressed the problem of corporate welfare. They don't want to deliver surplus commodities to school children, but they will give away the Nation's gold and silver to foreign corporations. They want to charge people to visit the U.S. Capitol, but they don't want to charge fair prices to special interests operating in national parks. They don't want to subsidize rent for

poor working families, but they will subsidize the rent for cows on public lands.

It is time for a review of all these programs. I am introducing this legislation today to start that review.

**PUBLIC RESOURCES DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT
SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS**

Sec. 1. Short Title and Table of Contents.

Title I—General Provisions

Sec. 101. Fair Market Value for Resources Disposal.—This section requires that fair market value be recovered for disposal of federal resources, including minerals, timber, forage, water and hydropower. The requirement is to be phased in at the end of 5 years. The President may waive the requirement upon a finding that a waiver is in the national interest.

Sec. 102. Fees from Program Beneficiaries.—This section authorizes the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior to charge user fees covering the costs of administering federal programs. Further, the section requires immediate imposition of such a fee for oil and gas lease transfers.

Sec. 103. Revenues from Sale, Lease, and Transfer of Assets.—This section requires that the annual budget submission from the President include an accounting of the subsidy involved in disposal of any federal assets.

Title II—Revenue from Mining Claims

Sec. 201. Definitions.—This section defines the terms "locatable mineral," "mineral activities," "exploration," "mining," "beneficiation," "processing," "mining claim" and "Secretary" for purposes of Title II.

Sec. 202. Mining Claim Maintenance Requirements.—This section requires mining claim holders to pay an annual fee of \$100 for maintenance of each claim. The claim may be waived by the Secretary of the Interior for those holding less than 10 claims.

Sec. 203. Royalty.—This section requires payment of a royalty of 8% of gross income for production of hardrock minerals on federal lands. The section further provides for record-keeping and reporting, requires the collection of interest for underreporting, and authorizes the collection of penalties for underreporting.

Sec. 204. Severance Tax.—This section establishes an 8% severance tax for hardrock minerals produced on nonfederal lands, including those lands already patented out of federal ownership.

Sec. 205. Fund for Abandoned Locatable Minerals Mine Reclamation.—This section authorizes the establishment of a fund for reclamation of land and water affected by past mining activity. The section further requires that the royalties collected under section 203 and the severance tax collected under section 204 be credited to the fund.

Sec. 206. Limitation on Patent Issuance.—This section prohibits further patenting of federal land for mining claims and millsites established after the date of introduction of this bill.

Sec. 207. Purchasing Power Adjustment.—This section requires that fees imposed under this act be adjusted every 10 years, according to the Consumer Price Index.

Sec. 208. Savings Clause.—This section provides that nothing in this act should be construed as modifying existing limitations on the application of the general mining laws.

Sec. 209. Effective Date.—This section provides that Title II shall take effect one year from date of enactment of this act, except as otherwise provided in section 206.

Title III—Helium

Sec. 301. Amendment of Helium Act.—This section provides that all references within this title are to be considered references to the Helium Act.

Sec. 302. Authority of Secretary.—This section authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to continue extraction and disposal of helium from public lands. In addition, the section requires the Secretary to cease production, refining and marketing, and requires disposal of equipment used for these purposes, 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. The section further authorizes the Secretary to impose fees to recover the full cost of providing services for storage, transportation, and withdrawal of helium.

Sec. 303. Sale of Crude Helium.—This section requires that funds from sales of refined helium and extraction of helium on public lands be credited toward repayment of the federal investment in the helium reserve.

Sec. 304. Elimination of Stockpile.—This section requires that excess helium in the federal helium stockpile be sold off, beginning by the year 2005 and ending by the year 2015.

Sec. 305. Repeal of Authority to Borrow.—This section repeals the Secretary's authority to borrow under the Helium Act.

Title VI—Use or Disposal of Federal Natural Resources

Sec. 401. Annual Domestic Livestock Grazing Fee.—This section requires that the annual grazing fee for grazing leases on public lands be set at fair market value beginning in the 1996 grazing season. The section further requires that funds from federal receipts be used for restoration, enhancement, and management of federal lands.

Sec. 402. Elimination of Below-Cost Timber Sales of Timber from National Forest System Lands.—This section requires that sales of timber from the National Forest System be based on a minimum bid that will cover all costs of the sale, including overhead. The section further requires that the cessation of below-cost timber sales be phased in over 5 years.

Sec. 403. Timberland Suitability.—This section requires that, in developing land management plans for the National Forests, the Secretary of Agriculture take into account the economic suitability of lands for timber production, including in the "timber base" only lands upon which sales of timber will cover all costs of the sales.

Sec. 404. Cost of Water Used to Produce Surplus Crops.—This section requires that federal irrigation water from the Bureau of Reclamation that is used to grow surplus crops be paid for at the "full cost" rate set in the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982.

Sec. 405. Reduction in Maximum Amount of Payments under Agricultural Assistance Programs to Reflect Receipt of Federal Irrigation Water.—This section requires that payment limits on agricultural price supports and crop disaster assistance include the value of the subsidized water an irrigator receives from the Bureau of Reclamation.

Sec. 406. Off Budget Expenditures.—This section moves into the General Fund of the Treasury timber receipts formerly paid into the Knutson-Vandenberg fund, the brush disposal fund, the roads and trails fund and the timber salvage sale fund.

Sec. 407. Deposit of Taylor Grazing Act Receipts in Treasury.—This section eliminates the authorization for payment out of the Treasury of a portion of grazing fee receipts.

Sec. 408. Repeal of Livestock Feed Assistance Program.—This section repeals the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to provide free livestock feed to ranchers.

Sec. 409. Communication Permits.—This section requires that permits for the use of communications sites on public lands must be established at fair market value as of October 1, 1995.

Sec. 410. Oil and Gas Rentals.—This section requires that oil and gas rental prices for leases on public lands be set at fair market value.

Title V—National Park Concessions

Sec. 501. Findings and Policy.—This section establishes Congressional findings and policy for this title.

Sec. 502. Definitions.—This section defines the terms "concessioner," "concession contract," "facilities," "franchise fee," "fund," "park," "proposal" and "Secretary" for purposes of Title V.

Sec. 503. Repeal of Concessions Policy Act of 1965.—This section repeals the Concessions Policy Act of 1965. This section further provides that existing contracts issued under that Act shall remain in force.

Sec. 504. Concession Contracts and Other Authorizations.—This section authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to award concessions contracts and authorizations for other visitor services in the National Parks as necessary and appropriate to accommodate park visitors.

Sec. 505. Competitive Selection Process.—This section requires competitive bidding for concessions contracts, with selection based on price and other criteria to determine entity best qualified to provide services. This section further provides a limited preferential right of renewal for certain outfitting and guide contracts, and certain contracts with gross receipts under \$500,000.

Sec. 506. Franchise Fees.—This section authorizes the Secretary to establish minimum franchise fees at levels that will allow concessioners to realize a profit.

Sec. 507. This section authorizes the establishment of a special account within the Treasury to receive payment of franchise fees.—This section further authorizes that in some cases a concessioner may maintain a separate Park Improvement Fund where its fees are deposited for use within the park.

Sec. 508. Duration of Contract.—This section requires that concession contracts be established for no longer than 10 or 20 years.

Sec. 509. Transfer of Contract.—This section prohibits transfer or assignment of concession contracts without approval of the Secretary.

Sec. 510. Protection of Concessioner Investment.—This section provides concessioners a "possessory interest" in structures and fixtures constructed under the terms of existing contracts. The section further provides that future structures and fixtures must be depreciated and the concessioners may maintain an interest only in the non-depreciated portion.

Sec. 511. Rates and Charges to Public.—This section requires the Secretary to judge the reasonableness of concessionaires' charges to the public in comparison to equivalent charges at private facilities in close proximity to the park, unless otherwise provided in the contract.

Sec. 512. Concessioner Performance Evaluation.—This section requires the Secretary to review the performance of concessioners on a regular basis, and authorizes termination of a concessioner whose performance is unsatisfactory.

Sec. 513. Recordkeeping Requirements.—This section requires concessioners to keep records mandated by the Secretary.

Sec. 514. Exemption from Certain Lease Requirements.—This section exempts con-

cession contracts from certain federal lease requirements.

Sec. 515. No Effect on ANILCA Provisions.—This section provides that this title shall not amend the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act.

Sec. 516. Implementation.—This section requires periodic audits and reports by the Secretary and Interior Inspector General.

Sec. 517. Authorization of Appropriations.—This section authorizes the appropriation of such sums as are necessary to carry out the title.

REMEMBER THE HOLOCAUST

HON. WILLIAM J. MARTINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate today to remember the horrible discoveries that were made by Allied forces at Auschwitz 50 years ago.

Words are insufficient to describe one of the blackest and most despicable crimes against humanity ever perpetrated. The actions of Nazi Germany aimed at the utter extermination of European Jews tore apart the collective souls of our parents' and grandparents' generations, tragically reminding them, lest they had forgotten, the depths to which the human character can sink. As the truths about the Holocaust emerged, we were forced as a nation to reassess not just the direction of the global community or our country, but to look inside ourselves and face many very difficult questions about the moral direction of our communities, our families, and ourselves. No citizen of good conscience could escape that important self-examination.

Fifty years later, the lessons from Auschwitz are the same. The suffering and anguish is still very real, and continues to act as a constant reminder of our obligations to the pursuit of decency and compassion, both at home and abroad.

But on this occasion I believe a sense of guarded optimism and quiet resolution are in order alongside of the tremendous sense of loss we still feel. For the United States is the leader of the free world. It was the United States that picked up the sword of Democracy to defeat the evil hand of the Axis Powers and restore security and prosperity to the world. And since then it has been the United States who has stood firm to make sure that such persecution would never occur again.

As we approach the 21st century, we must constantly bear in mind what America has become: a model of freedom and justice to the world. We strive for peace so that we never have to discuss another Auschwitz again. On this 50th anniversary of the horrible revelations at Auschwitz, let us all pause to reflect on several things. First and foremost, we remember the victims of the Holocaust with great sadness, and the survivors with consolation. We also need to remember how terrible the nature of man can be. But we in America should not lose sight of how far we have come. Most of all, we can never forget how diligent we must remain in the struggle to secure the safety of our posterity, and that of the posterity of our neighbors around the world.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE SYSTEMATIC APPLICATION OF VALUE ENGINEERING ACT

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that could significantly improve the way our Government does business. From all the discussion and speeches I've heard around the Capitol during the past couple of months, it is clear to me that this is a goal that we all share. It is certainly something that all of our constituents would like to see as well.

My bill would require Federal agencies to use value engineering [VE] which would enable the Government to save money while improving quality at the same time. This is a rare case where the taxpayers, the Government, and the American economy benefit—it's a win-win situation for everyone.

VE is a specialized, multifaceted, creative, team-conducted technique that defines the objective of a product, service, process, or construction project and questions every step toward reaching it. It does so with an eye to reducing all costs and completion time while improving quality, reliability, and aesthetics. Analysis covers the equipment, maintenance, repair, replacement, procedures, and supplies involved. Life-cycle cost analysis is one of its many aspects and it differs from other cost-cutting techniques in that it is far more comprehensive, scientific, and creative.

It is widely accepted that VE saves no less than 3 percent of a contract's expense, and commonly that figure is 5 percent. At the same time, the cost of doing a VE review ranges from one-tenth to three-tenths of a percent. Thus, on a \$2 million construction contract, the very minimum that would be saved would be \$54,000 while savings of \$98,000 is very likely. On a major military procurement contract for \$1 billion over a life-cycle, that translates to a range of savings from \$27 million to \$49 million. Based on VE usage in recent years, the ratio of the cost of a VE review to savings yielded from using VE has ranged from 1:10 to 1:100, with 1:18 being the most frequent result.

Whenever value engineering has been examined, it is clear that it should be used more often and that its untapped potential is too great to estimate. The General Accounting Office has conducted various studies on VE over the years and each one has acknowledged its achievements and potential. Currently, several Federal agencies and departments reap significant benefits from VE but its use has been far too sporadic to achieve widespread savings.

Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility to take advantage of VE. Ironically, although it was developed in the United States during World War II to maximize resources and improve our capabilities, it has been used most effectively by the Japanese electronics and automobile industries since that time. Isn't it time to bring this brainchild back home?

My bill, the Save Act, would provide significant savings and results by requiring all Fed-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

eral agencies to use VE. To ensure that taxpayers get the greatest bang for the buck, my bill requires agencies to use VE for their most expensive projects. In order to see that VE is used to its greatest potential, each agency is required to designate a senior official to oversee and monitor VE efforts. Also, annual reports to the Office of Management and Budget would be required to ensure full compliance.

Plainly and simply, VE could make the Government run better and cost less. We've all heard America's cry for change, shouldn't we respond? I urge my colleagues to join me and cosponsor the Save Act.

TRIBUTE TO FIRST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, this coming Sunday, January 29, 1995, the First United Methodist Church of Mount Clemens, in my home State of Michigan, is celebrating its 175th anniversary.

As one of the oldest churches in the area, the First United Methodist Church dates back to when Mount Clemens was little more than a settlement in the wilderness of Michigan. The preachers were known as circuit riders because they traveled by horseback throughout the region serving the various churches. These preachers were like a pony express to the faithful, serving as a vital link to the pioneer families by delivering the word of God.

From the very beginning, the founders of the First United Methodist Church of Mount Clemens were committed to seeing the emotional, educational, and spiritual needs of the community fulfilled. The commitment of the circuit riders and the faithful who used their homes as a place of worship helped meet needs too often neglected in the secular world.

The link between First United Methodist and the development of the Mount Clemens community were and still remain evident to this day. Before the public library was established, the church library served the readers of the wilderness community. Judge Christian Clemens, for whom the city is named, often used his log court house to host church services. Today, the congregation has been assisting in projects such as McREST, the program for feeding and housing the homeless, and a newly developed program called Logos which emphasizes involving young people from the community in church related events. I commend the congregation for their ongoing work and faith.

The 175th anniversary of the founding of the church is a proud milestone. As the community prepares to celebrate the event, I applaud the church for its contributions to the rich tapestry that makes up American life in Michigan. I urge my colleagues to join with me in wishing congratulations to all the members of the First United Methodist Church of Mount Clemens, MI. May the next 175 years be a continued fruitful ministry.

January 27, 1995

IN HONOR OF THE INDO-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP SEMINAR IN DELHI, INDIA

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to those who have coordinated a friendship seminar in Delhi, India. On February 12, 1995, the Federation of Indian Associations of New Jersey will hold the Indo-American Friendship Seminar. This federation is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, social and educational organization, committed to promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between the United States and India.

The fact that so many people are coming together in one place to promote harmony is a step in the right direction toward maintaining a positive relationship between the United States and India. I commend everyone who is taking part in this special seminar. I especially would like to thank those who have worked to coordinate it. Their dedication to making this event happen is encouraging and admirable.

I would like to acknowledge Hardyal Singh, president of the Federation of Indian Associations of New Jersey, for the role he has played in coordinating this conference. Mr. Singh has dedicated his career to serving the Indian community in New Jersey. He was the first Indian-American to be named a special deputy sheriff of Hudson County, and was successful in his campaign to have the Indian national flag raised at Jersey City city hall. Mr. Singh's contributions to the Indian community also include the role he played in renaming public school No. 23 to Mahatma Gandhi School and was instrumental in having a statue of Gandhi installed at this site.

S. Beant Singh, chief minister of Punjab State, a recipient of the Son of India Award, deserves recognition for the part he has played in making this conference happen. I would like to offer him my congratulations for his efforts to bring peace to Punjab State.

Please join me in wishing the participants of the Indo-American Friendship Seminar a successful conference. I am confident that all of the attendees, as well as all Indians and Americans, will reap the benefits of the discussions which will be held at the seminar. Furthermore, I would like to offer my best wishes to the Federation of the Indian Associations of New Jersey in their future endeavors.

AN EVENT OF REMEMBRANCE

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to acknowledge the Dallas Memorial Center for Holocaust Studies, in cooperation with the Jewish Community Relations Council, the Anti-Defamation League, the Greater Dallas Community of Churches, and the Greater Dallas Veterans Council, for their work in putting together an event for the entire

Dallas community celebrating and honoring the 50th anniversary of those heroic individuals who participated in the liberation of concentration camps during World War II. This tribute to these fine individuals will occur on February 12 at the Preston Hollow Presbyterian Church in Dallas.

This event will most certainly rekindle memories of the worst atrocity in contemporary history and is a historical milestone that should be deeply praised. It is only through this type of continual recognition of those atrocities of the past and the heroism that stopped it that we can work to prevent such inhumanity from occurring in the future. We must remember both that while there will always be those who would commit horrendous acts against humanity, it is up to all of us to stand up and stop them. We must make certain that similar atrocities to those committed in concentration camps never do happen again. We need not look far to see that all around the world we are confronted by barbarism. We cannot ever allow ourselves to forget what terrible atrocities can occur if acts of barbarism are allowed to progress.

Again, I commend those involved with putting together this important event of remembrance.

A BALANCED BUDGET FOR THE PEOPLE

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, last night we kept our promise to the American people and passed a balanced budget amendment. For years, the liberal controlled Congress acted like wild kids in a candy store. They thought every proposed government program looked tasty and grabbed them all. Now, the Nation is left with one huge fiscal stomach ache.

The new Republican controlled Congress provided the remedy last night. A balanced budget amendment will impose discipline on the indulgent habits of Congress. It will fundamentally change the way government works.

We are working hard to strip the shelves of those sweet temptations. We have a mandate from the American people—a commitment to work for less government, less spending, and less regulation. A balanced budget will work toward restoring the people's government. This is only the beginning. Now, we will continue to reject big government status quo by passing unfunded mandates legislation.

MARKING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article written by a great American and a great

friend named Col. Bernard Wray. Colonel Wray has spent his entire career advocating the needs of America's soldiers, both active and retired. In this article, Colonel Wray writes about the 50th anniversary of the passage of the GI bill of rights. I salute Colonel Wray for his commitment to America's military, and urge my colleagues to read his account of the passage of this landmark legislation.

UNITED-MANHATTAN POST NO. 9 AMERICAN LEGION SALUTES THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PASSAGE OF THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, commonly known as the GI Bill of Rights, was signed by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on June 22, 1944, in his office in the White House, flanked by Legionnaires John Stelle, former Governor of Illinois, and Commander Harry W. Colmery of Kansas, who drafted the GI Bill of Rights in December, 1943.

The American Legion Posts at the Grass Roots level, from all over the USA, demanded that Congress should provide for returning Veterans, unlike the dark days after World War I, when thousands of war veterans returned, homeless and helpless, with few places to turn for help. The American Legion rank-and-file members around the 48 states demanded a GI Bill, which was drafted entirely by the American Legion.

The GI Bill of Rights proved to be the most revolutionary piece of social and economic legislation ever enacted! It has educated over 20 million GI's, men and women Veterans, who served their Country with honor. It has helped over 14 million veterans to buy their own homes. Veterans who came from the poorer socioeconomic areas were given educational opportunities at the best colleges. Vocational and on-the-job training for technicians were provided. Loan guarantees to help Veterans purchase homes, farms and small businesses were provided; as were the 52-20 payments to Veterans who were looking for decent permanent jobs. Veterans Administration hospitals were built, and offered war heroes like Senator Bob Dole, and Senator Dan Inouye, top rehabilitation medicine, near their home towns.

The American Legion had to use every bit of its political clout to insure that members of the House and Senate, who told the veterans that they supported the GI Bill of Rights, kept their word and voted for it. Senator George Bennett "Champ" Clark, a World War I Veteran, who served with Captain Harry Truman, and who was the original founder of the American Legion in 1919, managed the GI Bill through the US Senate; where it carried unanimously.

In the House, and in the US Senate, on February 16, 1944, for reasons only they could understand, the VFW, Disabled American Veterans and Military Order of Purple Heart, requested of the Senate Finance Committee members, that they kill the GI Bill of Rights. Committee Chairman "Champ" Clark, to his great credit, brought the GI Bill to a Committee vote. It passed unanimously. The House version of the GI Bill of Rights passed by 387 to 0. But minor differences in the House and Senate versions had to be worked out by a joint conference committee. Representative John Rankin of Mississippi tried, at the last minute, to block the GI Bill of Rights. The American Legion found the deciding vote, Representative John D. Gibson, a member of the Joint Conference Committee recuperating from an illness, down in Douglas, Georgia. On the morning of June 10, 1944, Representative John D. Gibson was flown, thanks to the ef-

forts of the American Legion, to Washington DC where he stormed into the Joint Conference Committee room and cast the vote that broke the tie.

Millions of taxpayers who became doctors, lawyers, businessmen, clergymen, teachers, professors, entrepreneurs and responsible members of the Middle Class can thank the American Legion for their efforts, for lobbying for American Veterans. The GI Bill of Rights paid for itself by generating hundreds of billions of tax dollars paid by GI's over the next 50 years. Now, the American Legion recognizes, through its over 3,000,000 grass roots members that the original GI Bill of Rights, just as strong as the 1944 version in strength and stature, is needed. Post No. 9 will be in the front ranks in fighting for a stronger GI Bill of Rights.

RECOGNITION OF DR. WALTER WASHINGTON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1995

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I stand before my colleagues today to recognize the outstanding accomplishments of Dr. Walter Washington, a distinguished educator and community leader of Jackson, MS. Dr. Washington retired as President of Alcorn State University in Lorman, MS, in 1993 after serving as president for 25 years. Prior to his service as president of Alcorn State University, he served as president of Utica Junior College in Utica, MS. Thus, for several years, Dr. Washington held the distinction of being the longest serving college president in the United States.

Dr. Washington, a native of Hazlehurst, MS, was educated in the public schools of Copiah County, MS. He received a bachelor of arts degree from Tougaloo College, and graduate degrees from Indiana University, Peabody College of Vanderbilt University, and the University of Southern Mississippi.

Under his leadership, Alcorn State University increased its enrollment and expanded its academic programs and facilities. He also served as an excellent role model for college students because of his strong emphasis on academic excellence and community service.

In addition, Dr. Washington has held leadership positions in numerous local, State, and national organizations. He has been president of the Mississippi Teachers Association, national president of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, and national president of the Alumni Council of the United Negro College Fund. Dr. Washington has also been a member of the board of directors of the Mississippi Power and Light Co., the Entergy Corp., Blue Cross-Blue Shield of Mississippi, and the Southern Regional Education Board.

He has been listed in Outstanding Educators of America, Who's Who Among Black Americans, and in Ebony Magazine as one of the 100 most influential Black Americans.

I congratulate Dr. Washington for an outstanding career in education and public service and wish him well in his future endeavors.